

Fei
10/654,434

REMARKS

The undersigned requests a personal interview with the Examiner in charge of this application to discuss the issues raised below.

Claims 2, 3, 6-10 and 18-21 were rejected as being indefinite, largely based upon the use of "consisting of" in the preamble of claim 1. The offending language has been removed.

Claims 1-3, 6-10, 12 and 14-21 were rejected as being unpatentable over Razavi in view of Opel and St. Pierre.

Claim 14 was rejected as being unpatentable over the above references and further in view of Prince.

It is noted that claim 13 was not the subject of a rejection but presumably was meant to be included in one of the above groups.

Razavi does disclose the idea of a computer in an automobile but the disclosure is entirely schematic and the manner of incorporating the computer in the vehicle is not shown or illustrated. Applicant is not contending that the idea of having a computer in a vehicle is either new or novel.

Opel does show a control system for a vehicle with a control panel (not a computer keyboard) mounted in the steering wheel. The control panel shown is actually like a telephone keypad and cannot be considered equivalent to a computer keyboard.

St. Pierre has a steering wheel interface for vehicles for which it was cited.

Prince shows a foot controlled mouse for which the reference was cited.

The comments made by the Examiner in the application of the art do not adequately explain or suggest where and how the various segments of the computer system are arranged in the vehicle. It is true that Razavi does suggest many of the features of the present invention, but how these features are incorporated physically seem to be

Fei
10/654,434

lacking. The absence of a computer keyboard in the steering wheel of a vehicle is also noteworthy, and it is only hindsight which would suggest such a configuration.

The use of multiple display screens, not all showing the same display, all controlled from the keyboard in the steering wheel, seems also to be lacking in the art of record.

Claim 1 has been extensively amended to include many of the features of its depending claims, including that of claim 13 not mentioned in the last Office Action.

It is urged that only hindsight would suggest the combination of features now called for in this claim, and that includes placement of the various elements of the system.

A number of depending claims have been canceled and replaced by a new claim 22 which includes the foot pedal mouse and a plurality of displays as discussed above.

It is believed, for the reasons given above, that claim 22 is drawn to novel subject matter and should be allowed. Only hindsight would suggest the combination called for in this claim.

In view of the foregoing, it is urged that the remaining claims are drawn to patentable subject matter and should be allowed.

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned or Mr. Kroll if further changes are required to obtain allowance of the application.

A favorable action is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



LEONARD BELKIN
Reg. No. 18,063
Tel 301-254-8549

For
Michael I. Kroll
Reg. No. 26,755
171 Stillwell Lane

Fei
10/654,434

Syosset, New York 11791
Tel 516-367-7777

Dated: Nov. 15, 2005

CERTIFICATE OF FAXING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the U. S.
Patent and Trademark Office, telephone number 571-273-8300 on Nov. 15, 2005.


Leonard Belkin